

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 5-9 are pending in the present application. No claims are amended by the present amendment, thus, no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1 and 5-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as unpatentable over Boyle et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,138,158, herein “Boyle”).

Turning now to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claims 1 and 5-9 over Boyle.

Claim 1 recites, in part,

 said second server includes:

 detecting means for recognizing from said provision information, transmitted from said first transmitting means of said first server, that said first service has been provided to said first server and detecting said second service related to said first service;

 second transmitting means for transmitting recommendation information, for recommending said second service detected by said detecting means, to said first terminal;

 registering means for registering said second service that is recommended by said recommendation information and requested to be provided to the second terminal by said first terminal; and

 second providing means for providing said second service registered by said registering means to said second terminal in response to a request from said second terminal,

 wherein the first terminal is a mobile terminal and the second terminal is a stationary terminal.

Independent Claims 5, 7, 8 and 9 recite similar features.

MPEP §2131 states that “[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987) (emphasis added).

Claim 1 recites a detecting means for recognizing from said provision information, transmitted from said first transmitting means of said first server, that said first service has been provided to said first server and *detecting said second service related to said first service.*

The outstanding Action states on pages 4&5, in item (d)(i) that in Boyle "where the first service has been provided then it is connected to the link where the information of the mobile device is stored, i.e. identification number, so that when the second server has relevant information to provide it will know what device to send it to using the link explained and shown in the reference [Boyle]."

In other words, Boyle describes that when a mobile device signs up for a service, the service is associated with the mobile device by using an id number of the mobile device.

However, this id number feature of Boyle has nothing to do with the above feature recited in Claim 1 of recognizing that a first service and detecting a second service related to the first service.

In other words, Claim 1 describes that a second server receives information including a first service and information indicating that a first server has provided a mobile terminal with the first service. The second server then uses the first service to detect or find a second service related to the first service. This is clearly not described in Boyle.

Claim 1 further recites a second transmitting means for *transmitting recommendation information, for recommending said second service* detected by said detecting means, to said first terminal.

The outstanding Action states on page 5, in item (d)(ii) that Boyle "talks about the means of a link infrastructure used to communicate information between the two networks or the mobile device and the second network. Also it talks about having different microprocessor used for different means of transmitting the information as depicted in the

figure two the objects: 202, 104, 210, 206 and 106 as the arrows indicate flow of information traffic.”

However, although the discussion of two networks and microprocessors may be related to the transmission itself, this discussion is completely unrelated to features recited in Claim 1 of recommendation information which includes a recommendation for a second service related to the first service. In addition, the Office Action of July 28, 2006 acknowledged, on page 6, that Boyle does not describe or suggest recommendation information.

In other words, Claim 1 recites that recommendation information is transmitted from the second server to the first terminal (the user's location at the time of the recommendation) where the recommended service can be acquired by the user (registered). These features are not described or suggested by Boyle.

This is illustrated in a non-limiting example, in which a user might use his mobile phone (mobile device) to buy a ring-tone (first service) that is a theme song from a movie. The user's purchase would then be correlated with other available content. Then, for example, the system could immediately send the user on his mobile phone (mobile device) the option to buy the full movie (second service) corresponding to the ring-tone (first service) for view on his home PC (stationary device). If the user accepts the offer, when the user returns home, he can immediately access the movie (second service) from his home PC (stationary device) because he has purchased (registered) the movie (second service) on his mobile phone (mobile device).

In addition, Claim 1 recites *the first terminal is a mobile terminal and the second terminal is a stationary terminal.*

The outstanding Action states on pages 2 and 3 that “Boyle et al. discloses a first terminal {306} and a second terminal {304} or vise versa even a third terminal

{302}...hence the applicant's arguments about the reference of Boyle et al. not having a second terminal is moot for the reference of Boyle et al. states a second terminal even further a third terminal."

However, the outstanding Action does not address the feature that the first terminal is a mobile terminal and the second terminal is a stationary terminal (and as a result not a mobile terminal). Clearly terminals 302, 304 and 306 of Boyle are mobile terminals. Therefore, even if Boyle describes three mobile terminals, there is no discussion or disclosure of a second terminal that is a stationary terminal.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Boyle does not describe all of the features recited in Claim 1 and similarly Claims 5, 7, 8 and 9. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 5, 7, 8 and 9 and claims depending therefrom patentably distinguish over Boyle.

Additionally, with respect to above noted arguments, Applicants respectfully request that any future Office communication address each of these arguments so as to narrow the issues for appeal in this case.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The application as amended herewith is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBTON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)


Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073